

- 6 -

REMARKS

The Examiner has further rejected Claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by AiroPeek (for Windows Quick Tour). Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove. Specifically, in the spirit of expediting the prosecution of the present application, applicant has incorporated the subject matter of dependent Claim 16 into each of the independent claims.

With respect to dependent Claim 16, the subject matter of which is presently incorporated into each of the independent claims, the Examiner has relied on AiroPeek's disclosure of automatic name resolution where "machine names [are automatically mapped] to corresponding IP and Appletalk logical addresses" (page 4-6), detecting "various internet attacks including 'land', 'tear-drop', 'gin', 'jolt', oversize-IP, 'pimp', riptrace, and 'winnuke' attacks" (page 8), and finding sources of specific protocol traffic (page 10). Applicant respectfully asserts that such teachings clearly do not meet applicant's claimed "wherein said step of detailed protocol analysis includes the steps of permitting a user to enter the MAC addresses of known access points operating in said IEEE 802.11(b) wireless communication channel; selectively activating a rogue access point detection routine; checking the addresses of newly detected access points against the addresses of said known access points; and marking for display as a rogue access point, any access point detected that is not included as a known access point" (see this or similar, but not identical language in each of the independent claims).

Basically, AiroPeek merely teaches mapping already known machine names to IP addresses, detecting internet attacks and finding sources based on their protocol traffic. Such teaching does not include "selectively activating a rogue access point detection routine; checking the addresses of newly detected access points against the addresses of said known access points; and marking for display as a rogue access point, any access point detected that is not included as a known access point" (emphasis added). Simply nowhere in AiroPeek is there any suggestion of such specific claim language, especially in view of the fact that detecting internet attacks is not the same as rogue access point detection.

The Examiner is reminded that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d

- 7 -

1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.* 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

This criterion has simply not been met by the AiroPeek reference, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove. A notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of each of the foregoing claimed features, in combination with the remaining claimed features, is respectfully requested.

Applicant further notes that the prior art is also deficient with respect to the dependent claims. For example, with regard to dependent Claim 3, the Examiner has relied on AiroPeek's disclosure of setting filters for specific protocols (page 24) to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "selectively turning said detailed protocol analysis on or off for a particular protocol layer, whereby for a protocol layer turned off, that layer and all protocol layers above or higher than that layer are not subjected to a detailed protocol analysis."

Applicant respectfully asserts that setting filters, as in AiroPeek, merely filters what is displayed, and not what is analyzed, as is evidenced by AiroPeek's disclosure of "[d]isplay[ing] protocol information based on a total of the subprotocols under the parent protocol, or by each subprotocol broken-out in individual layers...[s]etting filters based on specific subprotocols is easy..." (see page 24, first row in table). Thus, AiroPeek clearly does not teach "selectively turning said detailed protocol analysis on or off....whereby for a protocol layer turned off, that layer and all protocol layers above or higher than that layer are not subjected to a detailed protocol analysis," as claimed by applicant (emphasis added).

With respect to dependent Claim 6, the Examiner has relied on AiroPeek's disclosure of "send[ing] a notification of a user-specified severity" (page 13) to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "wherein the step of performing a detailed protocol analysis further includes the steps of: assigning a default severity level from a plurality of available severity levels for each available alarm; and selectively determining whether a particular alarm type is to be logged when generated." Applicant respectfully asserts that such excerpt clearly fails to teach applicant's specific claim language. AiroPeek merely teaches sending a notification, whereas applicant's claim language includes "selectively determining whether a

- 8 -

particular type is to be logged when generated” (emphasis added). Clearly notifying a user and logging an alarm are completely different functions.

With respect to dependent Claim 11, the Examiner has relied on AiroPeek’s disclosed “address filter” (page 14) to make a prior art showing of applicant’s claimed “wherein said step of displaying includes the step of showing the hosts created for said IEEE 802.11(b) wireless communication layer, and the attributes of said hosts, respectively.” Applicant respectfully asserts that AiroPeek’s address filter merely “focus[es] on packets between specific network devices or packets being set to or received from a device” (see page 14). Simply filtering packets based on sending and receiving devices in no way meets applicant’s claim language since it completely fails to even mention “showing the hosts...and the attributes of said hosts,” as claimed by applicant (emphasis added).

A notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of all of applicant’s claim limitations, in combination with the remaining claim elements, is respectfully requested.

Still yet, applicant brings to the Examiner’s attention the subject matter of new Claims 18-19 below, which are added for full consideration:

“wherein said step of displaying includes utilizing a plurality of viewing panes” (see Claim 18); and

“wherein, for each available alarm, a user is capable of assigning a severity level chosen from the plurality of available security levels that is different from the default security level.” (see Claim 19).

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. For payment of the fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge

- 9 -

such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NA11P200). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
Zilka-Kotab PC



Kevin J. Zilka
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172-1120
Telephone: (408) 505-5100